

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 SEATTLE PACIFIC INDUSTRIES,  
10 INC.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 S3 HOLDING LLC, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

Case No. C18-0224RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
SEAL

15 This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiff’s Motion to Seal.” Dkt. # 24.  
16 Pursuant to the procedure set forth in LCR 5(g)(3), plaintiff filed the motion to seal only  
17 because defendant had designated the information confidential under the protective order  
18 entered in this case. Plaintiff does not believe the information is confidential, and  
19 defendant has not provided the necessary statement of applicable law and fact that would  
20 justify a seal.

21 “There is a strong presumption of public access to the court’s files.” LCR 5(g). In  
22 order to override the common law right to inspect and copy public documents, “a party  
23 seeking to seal judicial records must show that compelling reasons supported by specific  
24 factual findings outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring  
25

1 disclosure.” Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal  
2 quotation marks and alterations omitted). Neither party has attempted to make such a  
3 showing, and the Court finds that a party’s unilateral designation of a document as  
4 “confidential” during discovery does not, in and of itself, justify a seal. The motion (Dkt.  
5 # 24) is therefore DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to unseal Dkt. # 28 and # 29.

6  
7 Dated this 12th day of December, 2018.

8   
9

10 Robert S. Lasnik  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26